

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1918

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-six Branch Committees; 41,300* members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, PRESIDENT
MRS. JOHN BALCH, VICE-PRESIDENT
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. LOUIS A. PROTHINGHAM
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Honorary
Vice-
Presidents

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman

MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Legislative Committee
Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Membership Committee
Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Meetings Committee
Chairman

MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

Publicity Committee
Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interest League
President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League
President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary

MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. A. H. PARKER

State Organizer
MISS ALICE D. W. WHITE

*Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

THE SUFFRAGE DEFEAT

After holding up the important business before the Senate for five days, the suffragists went down to a well-deserved defeat on the 1st of October. And this in spite of the fact that they had persuaded President Wilson to violate all precedents by going before the Senate to urge the passage of the resolution as "a war measure." Not a single vote was changed by the President's appeal; and the resolution received only 53 affirmative votes to 31 opposed, with 12 Senators paired.

When they set the 26th of September for the taking of the vote, they professed absolute confidence as to the result. They had—they claimed—the requisite two-thirds majority, and three or four votes to spare. There would be, it was announced, a brief debate, and then the amendment would go through. It was added, joyously, that unpleasant surprises awaited the anti-suffragists, when certain Senators who had been counted on to oppose the amendment would be found voting for it.

But the unpleasant surprises were on the other side. Suffrage leaders discovered that their costly and truculent lobbying had been wasted; and that Senators who sincerely believed that the crisis of the greatest war in history was not "the time of times" to override the popular will and force upon the country a revolutionary experiment, could not be shaken in their convictions, either by pressure from the White House or by threats as to what might happen to them at the elections. They stood their ground. And when it became clear that the suffragists intended to take advantage of the patriotic activities of anti-suffrage Senators who had made engagements to speak in other cities in behalf of the Liberty Loan, by forcing

a vote while they were absent, they determined, if necessary, to carry on a filibuster until the absent Senators were back in their seats. So, the suffrage campaign went to pieces, and the amendment was defeated.

Senator Jones announced his purpose to keep the resolution on the calendar, "so that if there should be a change in favor of it before March 4, when the present Congress expires, he would be in a position to ask for another vote." This announcement will alarm no one, for the entire Senate is now on record, and Senators who resisted the President's entreaties on the 1st of October are not likely to change now.

Defeat of the amendment in the Senate practically wipes out the favorable vote in the House on the 10th of January. For the submission of an amendment to the States, it is essential that both branches shall vote favorably during the life of one Congress. When the new Congress begins its sessions, the issue will come up again; and the favorable action of the present House, which was gained by the narrow margin of a single vote, and was of doubtful constitutionality at the best, because two-thirds of the full membership did not vote in favor, will count for nothing.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

Following is a list of the Senators who, on the 1st of October, in spite of the President's insistence, stood firmly by the principles of representative government and the rights of Congress and of the States, and voted or were paired against the suffrage amendment:

DEMOCRATS: Bankhead, Beckham, Benet, Fletcher, Guion, Hardwick, Hitchcock, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Pomerene, Reed, Saulsbury, Shields, Simmons, Smith of Georgia,

Smith of Maryland, Smith of South Carolina, Swanson of Virginia, Trammell, Underwood, Williams and Wolcott.

REPUBLICANS: Baird, Borah, Brandegee, Dillingham, Drew, Hale, Knox, Lodge, McLean, Penrose, Wadsworth and Weeks.

CLEARING SKIES

Since the defeat of the suffrage resolution in the Senate, the anti-suffrage movement is in a better position than it has been for a long time.

For one thing, the organization is stronger. The removal of the National Headquarters to Washington was a wise step. It placed the National Association at the centre of suffrage activities, and enabled it to counteract suffrage misrepresentations. The Association has been very fortunate in its President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., whose rare combination of tact, energy and devotion has made her an invaluable factor in the struggle for true woman's rights—the right to do her own work for humanity and the country and the prosecution of the war, free from entangling political associations and enfeebling strife. The establishment of an eight-page weekly newspaper, *The Woman Patriot*, has given the Association such an opportunity to influence public opinion as it has not before enjoyed. The State Associations are cooperating loyally with the National, and new State Associations have been organized in States where they did not formerly exist.

As to Congress and the Federal Amendment, the outstanding fact is that, in spite of an hysterical and unscrupulous campaign, re-enforced by pressure from the White House of a sort never before exercised, the suffragists have not carried their point. Their apparent victory in the House of Representatives in January was due to the absence, through illness, of two anti-suffrage Representatives; and was by a vote which fell short of the two-thirds of the membership, which the United States Con-

stitution plainly requires. In the face of insults, personal abuse and threats, the anti-suffrage Senators have stood firm.

As time has passed, it has become increasingly clear that the suffrage victory in New York last year was not an indication of a national change of sentiment, but a local victory, due to local conditions. It was the Socialist-pro-German vote in New York city which gave the State to the suffragists, for, outside of New York city, the State defeated the amendment. That these influences were not national, but local, is plainly shown by the fact that, on the same day the voters of Ohio defeated a suffrage measure by a majority of 146,120; and in Maine, two months before, a proposed suffrage amendment was rejected at the polls by a majority of nearly two to one. As these facts have been realized, the discouragement at first felt by some anti-suffragists over the New York vote has passed; and the effort now in progress to secure a re-submission of the question, in which women, for the first time, can share, is watched with growing interest.

The open alliance in New York between the suffragists and the Socialists, resulting in an American Bolshevik, has roused the conservative sentiment of the country as never before.

Anti-suffragists, therefore, will enter the campaigns this fall in the States where the question is to be submitted to the voters, and will exert every legitimate influence upon Congress with good courage, and a firm assurance in the justice of their cause. They will do this without any lessening of their war activities, but strong in the conviction that they are thereby serving the highest and most enduring interests of their country.

AND NOW TEXAS

Last year, the Indiana Supreme Court consigned to the scrap-heap the famous "nine-tenths suffrage law" upon which the suffragists had

vaunted themselves as the very latest thing in the shape of clandestine suffrage legislation.

Now, the Seventy-ninth District Court of Texas has taken similar action regarding the recently-enacted bill which gave women the right to vote at primary elections, a bill modeled on the Arkansas pattern. In both States, it is the primary election which counts; as the election proper is hardly more than a form.

The Arkansas law may well follow the Texas statute into the discard, for the obnoxious word "male" occurs in both Constitutions among the qualifications of voters. Also, as indicated elsewhere, the North Dakota partial suffrage bill is headed the same way, for the same reason.

QUICKLY ANSWERED

In the advertising columns of Boston papers on the 25th of September, Mrs. Charles Sumner Bird, in behalf of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, printed a frenzied protest against statements in an appeal made by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts for dollar subscriptions to the Anti-Suffrage cause.

The appeal in question was printed in full in Mrs. Bird's advertisement, which is doubtless the first time that an anti-suffrage appeal has been given publicity at suffrage expense. Mrs. Bird, it appears, was incensed by two statements. The first was a reference to the anti-suffrage movement as "a crusade for Home and Country against Socialism, Feminism and Woman Suffrage." This, Mrs. Bird described as "a contemptible implication." But the open alliance between Socialism, Feminism and Woman Suffrage is too well established to be disposed of by an epithet.

The second statement against which Mrs. Bird protested was this:

"There is a growing conviction among thoughtful people that Germany, while repudiating Woman Suffrage at home is, and has been during the war, working to further the measure in this country."

This statement Mrs. Bird described as "even more amazing" and "outrageous," and she called upon the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association "to repudiate this untruthful and insulting 'appeal'."

Mrs. Bird's demand received a quick response, but not exactly of the kind which she had called for. The advertising columns of the papers in which Mrs. Bird's "Protest" had appeared contained the following, the next day:

"Replying to the challenge from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Suffrage Association to the undersigned Committee of the Anti-Suffrage Dollar Drive—a reading of the leaflet 'Is Woman Suffrage Pro German?' issued September 16, 1918, by the Public Interests League of the Anti-Suffrage Association will amply prove all statements made. We will welcome the opportunity to give this leaflet and other proof to any one sufficiently interested to call or write for them. We have already mailed copies to our challengers.

MARY B. FORBES.

KATHERINE T. BALCH.

MARY K. V. WHITE.

Boston, Mass., Sept. 25, 1918.

If Mrs. Bird had read this leaflet before printing her "Protest" in the Boston papers, it is possible that she would have questioned the wisdom of issuing her challenge. The REMONSTRANCE will take pleasure in sending a copy to any reader who may ask for it.

SUFFRAGE IN NORTH DAKOTA

The question of the validity of the partial woman suffrage Act in North Dakota has been submitted to the Supreme Court of that State, on appeal from the favorable decision of a lower court.

The North Dakota Constitution states specifically that "every male person of the age of twenty-one" who has qualified as a legal resident shall be entitled to vote. It further provides that "the legislative Assembly shall be empowered to make further extensions of suffrage hereafter, but no law extending or restricting the

right of suffrage shall be in force until adopted by a majority vote of the electors at a general election." To the ordinary lay mind, that seems sufficiently plain.

WITHOUT AUTHORITY

One of the banners which the suffragettes of the Woman's Party flaunted opposite the White House on the 6th of August carried this inscription: "We protest against the continued disfranchisement of American women, for which the President of the United States is responsible."

Were the women who flaunted this banner aware that the Constitution of the United States gives the President no power whatever in the amendment of that instrument?

The framers of the Constitution presumably knew what they were about—at least their wisdom in this particular has never been questioned—when they drew a sharp distinction between the process of legislation, and the process of amending the Constitution. As to legislation, every proposal must be submitted to the President for his approval. He may approve it, or he may disapprove and veto it. His judgment in the matter counts for as much as the judgment of two-thirds of the membership of both houses of Congress, for it requires that number to override his disapproval and enact the measure.

But, in the amending of the Constitution, the President is given no authority at all. He is not empowered to initiate amendments; for, as Bancroft's "Constitution of the United States," Vol. 2, page 329, accurately states: "*As to the initiation of amendments, it could not be entrusted to the President, lest it might lead him to initiate changes for his own advantage.*" Neither is it in his power to block an amendment by a veto; for the affirmative action of Congress requires a two-thirds vote of both houses, which is all that would be necessary to override a veto.

Yet it was in this very field of action, where the Constitution gives

him no authority, that the suffragists insisted that he must act. *The Suffragist* of the 8th of June gave him these direct orders:

"Let him go to the Senate of the United States and demand the three votes lacking from the twenty-three Administration servants who are at present blocking the suffrage amendment."

Such a proceeding as *The Suffragist* demanded had not been known since the foundation of our Government. The amazing thing is that he yielded to the demand.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT SURVIVES

(Editorial in the Boston Herald, Oct. 2, 1918)

President Wilson has met his first defeat on any measure declared necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. And he has been now defeated because nobody really believed woman suffrage necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, or that he, in his heart of hearts for a moment thought so.

And still the President sincerely desired to see this amendment go through the Senate. He wanted to get the dispute off the Washington map, and to deprive the Republicans of the West in the coming campaign of what they were evidently getting ready to use as a battle-cry. He let it be known, through his followers, that he would not help in the re-election of any Senators who opposed him on this point. That recalled the black-listing from which southern Senators have of late suffered so seriously.

It was quite undignified for the President of the United States to address a single chamber, on a controverted point like this, his own party furnishing most of the recalcitrants, and to do so at a time when they had so many fresh examples in mind of the personal risk of obstructing his policies. A question much larger than woman suffrage thus arose, in which the transcending duty of the Senate was to defend the ancient order of representative government, in distinction from concentrating all authority in the executive. Right-thinking people, regardless of their views of woman suffrage, should rejoice in the assertion of itself which the Senate made yesterday. All honor to the men who walked up to the line to do it.

PRO-SUFFRAGE AND PRO-GERMAN

William Randolph Hearst, proprietor of *Examiners* and *Journals* in New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other cities, who has lately put himself forward as the principal agent of suffrage propaganda in this country, has been put in a somewhat embarrassing position by the disclosure of his personal relations with Bolo Pasha, who was executed in France as a traitor, and with Count von Bernstorff, former German ambassador at Washington who, up to his enforced departure, spent money freely in pushing German schemes.

Intimations having been made that Mr. Hearst was on intimate terms with Bolo Pasha when he was carrying on his intrigues in New York, Mr. Hearst, in a statement published Oct. 5, 1917, said:

"I met Bolo Pasha merely as a French newspaper man—the reputed representative of the *Paris Journal*. . . . The conversation was general and trivial, as it is at such social dinners. That is all that I have ever known, seen or heard of Bolo Pasha. I defy the attorney-general (Attorney General Lewis of New York) to disprove any word in this statement of mine or to substantiate any one of his own unwarranted implications."

Replying to this challenge, Attorney General Lewis, on the 11th of August, made public six affidavits going to show that Mr. Hearst frequently received the French adventurer and traitor at his home on Riverside Drive, and that Count von Bernstorff accompanied him on a number of occasions. Five taxi-cab drivers swore that they frequently drove von Bernstorff and Bolo Pasha from the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, where the ambassador was stopping, to the Hearst home; a former elevator operator at the Hearst apartment swore that Ambassador Bernstorff and Bolo Pasha were such frequent visitors that the employees of the establishment devised nicknames for them, the Ambassador being called the "Duke

De La Brew" and Bolo the "Duke De La Car"; and the former superintendent of the apartment, Charles H. Jerome, made an affidavit that the German Ambassador was a frequent caller on Mr. Hearst, and that he remembered at least two occasions when Bolo Pasha called. Summarizing briefly the evidence in his possession, Attorney General Lewis said:

"I showed by the testimony of Hearst's Paris correspondent, Bertelli, given on the trial of Bolo for treason, that, instead of Hearst meeting Bolo only once, he met him three times; first, Hearst entertained Bolo at luncheon; second, Bolo entertained Mr. Hearst at the Sherry dinner; and third, Hearst entertained Bolo at a theatre party and supper.

I am now prepared to show by six affidavits that Hearst received Bolo at the Hearst home on Riverside Drive. I am prepared to show by three affidavits that Hearst received Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, and Bolo at the Hearst home at one and the same time, and that this happened on two or more occasions. I am prepared to show by many affidavits that Count von Bernstorff was a frequent visitor at the Hearst home at about the time of Bolo's visit to New York in the spring of 1916, when Bolo obtained \$1,683,000 from von Bernstorff to carry on the same German propaganda in France that Hearst was then conducting in America."

These statements are specific and are sustained by a considerable amount of definite evidence. They suggest the question whether Mr. Hearst, in his anxiety to rid himself of all suspicion of association with Bolo Pasha in his statement of October, 1917, may not have carried his denial a shade too far. They also suggest the question whether, in view of these pro-German affiliations, the ardent and widely-advertised championship of suffrage by Mr. Hearst and his chain of newspapers is altogether an asset to the suffrage cause.

COMPELLED TO VOTE

One of the amendments submitted by the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, to be voted on next

month, provides for compulsory voting. This amendment, if accepted, as it is likely to be, will hit pretty hard the easy-going male voter, who votes when he feels like it, but allows trivial causes to keep him from the polls.

Incidentally, if this amendment is adopted, we shall hear no more in Massachusetts of the familiar suffrage slogan: "Let the women who want to vote, vote; those who don't want to vote needn't." And: "If only one woman wants to vote, she ought to be allowed to. It is a shame that women who don't want the ballot should stand in the way of those who do want it." Under the new order of things, giving the vote to one woman or to any women will mean forcing it upon all.

The proposed amendment rests on the principle that the ballot is not a plaything or a privilege, as most suffragists have treated it, but a duty, and a very important duty.

If the question of woman suffrage is ever again submitted to Massachusetts voters, they will have to decide whether, in their judgment, it is fair or right to force the necessity of voting upon the great mass of Massachusetts women, who not only have not asked for the ballot, but who believe that woman suffrage would be an injury both to their sex and to the state, at the frenzied demand of a small but noisy minority.

It is safe to predict that, under these conditions, Massachusetts voters would bury the proposal under a majority even heavier than the practically two-to-one vote of November, 1915.

THE vote in the Senate teaches one lesson quite plainly, namely, that to call a proposal a "war measure" does not make it so. Both houses of Congress have given complete, or nearly complete support to all real war measures, conferring vast powers upon the President; but when he demanded of the Senators that they surrender their convictions on the suffrage amendment, which has appeared and reappeared in Congress for forty years, they said No.

**"AS AN EXAMPLE TO THE
WORLD"**

Regarded merely as rhetoric, there is something impressive in President Wilson's phrase: "I believe our present position as champions of democracy throughout the world would be greatly strengthened if the Senate would follow the example of the House of Representatives in passing the pending amendment."

But, when the phrase is subjected to cold scrutiny, and it is asked: "Precisely what does the President mean?" and: "In what way would the position of the United States as a champion of democracy be strengthened throughout the world by the passage of the suffrage amendment?" it is not easy to find an answer.

The plain truth is that the suffragists have declared that the present time—the time of the great war, when all patriotic activities are or should be concentrated upon war work—is "the time of times" to press their divisive and revolutionary measure. The British Pankhursts dropped their lawless demonstrations at the outbreak of the war. But the American Pankhursts have carried theirs beyond all bounds. They have libeled their country; they have reviled Congress; they have insulted the President; they have flaunted disloyal and seditious banners about the White House. They have played into the hands of the Germans by making it possible for the German propaganda to represent the United States as a country rent by internal divisions, and not united in the prosecution of the war. Would it really be a demonstration of the strength of American democracy to give such a group all that they ask for, under the stress of menace and insult?

And what nations of the world are they whose good opinion the United States should seek to win by such a course? Senator Reed of Missouri put and answered this question effectively in the Senate on the 8th of August, when he said:

Let us stop and ask what nation. England? England still has a king and an hereditary aristocracy. France? No; France has not granted it herself. France is the only republic in this war except ourselves, and France has manhood suffrage. Not a single Frenchman will charge with any greater keenness or die with any more courage because we give women the right to vote. What about Italy? It is a monarchy. Do we have to grant suffrage in order that we may advance to the high democratic ground that monarchy holds?

Where then is the ally that we must satisfy? Is it Russia? There is only one thing worse than an autocracy that I have ever known, and that is Bolshevism. Are we to grant suffrage to women in the United States to please the Bolshevik? I say the sooner we let the Bolshevik know that they cannot betray us to Germany, the sooner we give them to understand that they must keep their covenant of faith the better, and instead of catering to them by changing our laws to please that combination of insanity, of brutality and of anarchy the sooner we tell them there are international responsibilities that must be recognized by them, the better it will be.

A war measure? There is not a man in this Chamber who believes it is a war measure. So far as I am concerned, and let me say this with due deliberation, I will never change an important law of the United States, written by the people of this country, to please any nation on earth. I will not do it to please the long-haired, wild-eyed anarchistic Bolshevik. I will not do it to please any king who sits upon a throne. I will not do it, or permit it if I can help it, save only when the people of this country, considering their own affairs, believe the law ought to be changed.

**NO JEANNETTE RANKINS OVER
THERE**

The British people are to be commiserated for having woman suffrage thrust upon them through the hasty action of Parliament, without being allowed any opportunity for an expression of the popular will.

But there are two mitigating circumstances. One is that only women of thirty years or over will be permitted to vote. This eliminates a

large part of the more radical and dangerous element among women voters.

The other is that, according to a statement made in the House of Commons by Andrew Bonar Law on the 8th of August, all of the law officers of England, Ireland and Scotland agree that women cannot sit in the House of Commons. It has been intimated that there might be as many as 300 women candidates in the field at the next election; but their hopes are nipped in the bud by this decision. There will be no Jeannette Rankins over there.

**"THE CONSENT OF THE
GOVERNED"**

(Frederic A Whiting in the Boston Herald, Aug. 3)

In these tragic times, it would seem to be the acme of any great man's ambition to serve God and humanity only, losing his personal ambitions in exercising only the unexampled powers given him, rather than pull partisan wires and advocate partisan causes, to the great detriment of his claims to true and abiding greatness. Mr. Wilson has more than once been given world-wide applause for his high and noble phrases relative to the inflexible justice of basing events on "the consent of the governed." But of what avail ringing eloquent changes on this self-evident truth, and then lending the weight of his name and office toward forcing the ballot on a great majority of the "governed" who are bitterly opposed to having this responsibility forced upon them?

REMEMBER THE CAUSE

Anti-Suffragists who wish to exert a continuing influence in behalf of the cause which they have at heart can achieve that result by including the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association among the organizations which they remember in their wills. The huge Leslie Bequest has enabled the Suffragists to finance State campaigns with an utter disregard of cost as was seen in New York in 1917, and to maintain a large and costly lobby at Washington. Anti-Suffragists do not intend to follow Suffragist methods in the large expenditure of money; but a permanent Anti-Suffrage Fund, the income of which could be drawn upon to re-enforce current contributions, would be of great use to the cause.

SENATOR SHIELDS'S ATTITUDE

The correspondence between President Wilson and Senator Shields of Tennessee on the proposed Federal Suffrage Amendment was interesting and significant.

The President, in strongly urging the Senator to reverse his attitude and vote for the amendment—a step which, he admitted, he would not feel justified in taking, under ordinary circumstances—used the single argument that “much of the morale of this country and of the world will repose in our sincere adherence to democratic principles,—will depend upon the action which the Senate takes in this now critically important matter.” How the President reconciles this vague generalization with the obvious injustice of forcing upon states a policy which the majority of the voters have rejected, and upon women a responsibility which the great majority of them do not want, and the obvious mischief of splitting the ranks of both men and women upon a side issue when there is need of the concentration of all energies upon winning the war, it would be futile to inquire.

But the reply of Senator Shields, while perfectly courteous in its promise of thoughtful consideration of the President's letter, is so firm and definite in its statement of his reasons for opposing woman suffrage that it deserves quotation at some length. The Senator wrote:

“The resolution involves fundamental questions affecting the sovereignty and powers of federal and state governments, most important and vital to the people of the State I have the honor in part to represent in the United States Senate, and those of the states with which they are closely allied in all social, economical and governmental interests, upon which I have most profound convictions, unfavorable to it, known, and I believe approved, by the great majority of the people of Tennessee—arrived at after full consideration of conditions existing when I voted against a similar one some years ago, and those now confronting our country. . . We cannot reasonably expect

the proposed amendment to be ratified within less than two years and the discussion of it would unquestionably divert the minds and energies of the people from the one great absorbing subject—the winning of the war—by involving those of many states in a most bitter controversy contrary to our earnest desire for that unity of thought and action of the American people now so imperatively required.”

The fundamental and unanswerable objection to forcing the suffrage issue at this time of crisis in the nation's and the world's history has never been more forcibly stated.

AN “INTERNAL AFFAIR”

The United States Supreme Court, in its decision pronouncing unconstitutional the Federal Child Labor Law, which prohibited the interstate shipment of the products of child labor, used the following striking words:

“The power of the States to regulate their purely internal affairs by such laws as seem wise to the local authority is inherent and has never been surrendered to the general government.”

This is a statement of wide application, and it has an important bearing upon the suffrage question. Child labor laws vary widely in the different states; and the United States Supreme Court rules that such legislation is “a purely internal affair,” and that the power of the States over it is “inherent and has never been surrendered to the general government.”

But the suffrage laws also vary widely in the different states. In Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska and some other states, an alien who has merely declared his intention to become a citizen has the same right to the ballot as a native-born American. In Massachusetts, only such aliens as have completed their naturalization can vote. In Oregon, an alien, to be allowed to vote, must have declared his intention to become a citizen at least one year before an election. In Nebraska, only felons and insane persons are excluded from the suffrage; in Idaho bigamists are put under the ban; in New York, offenders

against elective franchise rights, persons guilty of bribery or of betting on elections, and persons convicted of felony are excluded, while convicts in the House of Refuge or Reformatory are not disqualified. In Oregon, South Dakota and Texas, United States soldiers, seamen and marines are excluded from the ballot—a discrimination which reads strangely in times like these. There is also a wide variation in educational qualifications or the absence of them.

Clearly, the regulation of the suffrage has always been treated as “a purely internal affair;” the power of the states over it has always been regarded as “inherent” and “has never been surrendered to the general government.” The United States Supreme Court, when it defined the rights of the state regarding child labor legislation, can never have contemplated for a moment sustaining action by the general government which would allow Nevada, Wyoming, Idaho, with any other group of states, to override the legislation of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut and other male-suffrage states as to the qualifications of voters.

SENATOR JAMES'S DEATH

There was no more popular man in the United States Senate than Ollie M. James of Kentucky, who died in a Baltimore hospital on the 28th of August, at the early age of 47. Senator James had served five terms in the House, and was just finishing his first term in the Senate. On the 3d of August, he was renominated at a state-wide primary, and at that time his recovery was confidently expected. His personal popularity on both sides of the Senate made more flagrant the refusal of the suffrage managers in the Senate on the 27th of June to allow him the customary privilege of a pair, when he was known to be seriously ill. The suffragists had hoped to profit by his illness, and would have done so if the Senatorial sense of fair play had not revolted against such tactics.

THE SUFFRAGE PARTNERS

In the Senate, on the 8th of August, Senators McKellar of Tennessee, Thomas of Colorado and Smoot of Utah,—all of them advocates of suffrage, and two of them from suffrage states—denounced in strong terms the demonstrations of the Woman's Party suffragettes, and deplored their inevitable effect in setting back the suffrage cause. Senator Thomas went so far as to say "if this picketing propaganda is to be revived, it may cause some of us to reconsider our declared attitude concerning this amendment."

Senators McKellar and Thomas seemed to find some consolation in the assumption that the suffragette outbreaks were disapproved by the National Woman Suffrage Association. Mr. Thomas said: "I trust the Senator does not confuse the organization of which Mrs. Catt is President, with the outfit which had one of its periodic outbreaks on the streets a few days ago"; and Mr. McKellar said: "I think we all understand that the organizations are entirely separate and that a very great difference exists between the purposes of the two organizations."

The solicitude of these Senators to make it appear that the two suffrage organizations are "entirely separate" and that "a very great difference" exists between their purposes is easily understood, but there is no foundation for it. The fact is that they are partners, working for the same cause along slightly different lines. As Senator Wadsworth said, in reply to Senator Thomas:

"For many, many months, Senators, we have seen these two groups, if we may call them two groups, of women working together in the lobbies of the Senate, conferring together in utmost friendship, comparing notes, importuning Senators, with no distinction as between the two groups, addressing each other by their Christian names, with no sign of enmity between them."

In confirmation of the practical union of the two groups, here is the

declaration of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, at the suffrage convention in Washington, Dec. 5, 1913:

"If our Constitution prevents our enfranchisement, I say 'let us tear it into shreds and make a new one.' Our cause can wait no longer. We must train our guns upon Congress, upon the South; we must train them even upon some members of our own organization, for we want freedom by Federal amendment and we want it now."

Since then, the organization of which Mrs. Catt is the head has been "training its guns" as advertised. There were once some differences between the two groups, and the younger organization had charged the other with having "gone to seed." But no such charges are heard now. The older organization has trailed in the path of the other, and formed an alliance with it. No longer ago than the 3d of last January, Mrs. Catt, speaking before the Woman Suffrage Committee of the House of Representatives, said:

"We have now come to the time when we no longer want a referendum, when we will no longer take a referendum, and when we therefore come to Congress and ask for a Federal amendment."

If the National Woman Suffrage Association had found it possible to disavow, or had deemed it safe to criticise the performances of the Woman's Party, its national organ, *The Woman Citizen*, would scarcely have refrained from all editorial expression in its issues of August 10 and August 17, immediately following the outbreaks. This is a case in which emphatically "silence gives consent."

SENATOR WEEKS

Governor McCall's candidacy for the office of United States Senator to succeed Senator Weeks was of brief duration. It was announced with characteristic positiveness, and, up to the day of his withdrawal, it was gen-

erally expected that he would stay in the field until the primaries.

If the conditions had been reversed, and Senator Weeks had withdrawn in favor of Governor McCall, the suffragists would have hailed the fact as a triumph for their cause. They would have said that Senator Weeks was paying the penalty for his steady and consistent opposition to woman suffrage. It is perhaps permissible for anti-suffragists to feel that Governor McCall's active identification with suffrage did not prove quite as much of an asset as his friends anticipated.

As to Senator Weeks, the signatures on his nomination papers totaled more than 50,000 names,—the largest number on record for any candidate since the primary system came in.

A SUFFRAGIST'S PROTEST

(Alice Brown, in *The Boston Herald*, Sept. 2, 1918)

It seems to us that we are wounded in the house of our friends, in that suffragists can during this crisis attempt to force the country into facing a secondary issue. Without inquiring too curiously into Mr. Wilson's underlying reason for advocating the measure at this unstable time, it is enough to say that women who divert toward it one ounce of energy, one dollar of money which might be felt in the war, are sacrificing the greater for the less. Suffragists have worked magnificently for the war. But they have also worked for suffrage. Doubtless they consider the vote a tremendous factor toward winning the war. That they cannot know. We may believe that women have, in justice, a right to the vote; but we cannot possibly guess how the great majority will use it. . . . At this crisis, chances are to be feared.

SENATOR JONES of New Mexico, the suffrage manager in the Senate, did not think it prudent on the 1st of October, to violate all rules of decorum and fair play by refusing pairs, as he did in June, in the case of Senator James. The entire membership of the Senate was represented in the vote.

A CHANCE TO HELP

Massachusetts anti-suffragists have no State Campaign on their hands this fall, thanks to the good sense of the Constitutional Convention in refusing to submit a suffrage amendment.

But there are suffrage campaigns in other States, where the conservative forces need encouragement and reinforcement. In Michigan, the same Legislature which enacted a presidential suffrage bill passed a resolution submitting to the voters a suffrage amendment to the constitution. This was something which the suffragists did not want, though, of course, they will now do everything in their power to secure its adoption. If it can be defeated by a sufficiently large majority, the next Legislature may be moved to repeal the presidential suffrage law. In Oklahoma and in Louisiana, amendments to the State constitutions are to be voted on. In South Dakota, through a suffragist trick, the proposed suffrage amendment has been joined with an amendment making more strict the conditions of alien voting, so that a voter who wishes to oppose woman suffrage must also vote against the other proposal. This proceeding is of doubtful constitutionality; but the voters may well defeat the measure as it stands, and take up the alien question later. In Arkansas, where the right to vote at primaries was given to women a couple of years ago, a proposed new constitution is to be submitted to the voters in which full woman suffrage is embodied.

In these States, and in States where the suffragists are making brazen attempts to defeat Senators and Representatives who have stood by their convictions in spite of suffrage entreaties and threats, there is need of anti-suffrage organization and effort. The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, whose headquarters are at 1621 K Street, Washington, D. C., is in touch with the situation in all these States, and is co-operating with the anti-suffrage forces in them. Massachusetts anti-suffragists, re-

lieved of the necessity of carrying on a campaign in their own State this year, should give prompt and generous help to the National Association in its nation-wide work.

"SENATOR RANKIN?"—HARDLY

The voters of Montana—men and women—seem to have felt that Miss Jeanette Rankin overestimated herself when she put herself forward as a candidate for the United States Senate. They calmly but resolutely relegated her to private life at the primaries in August. Whether this was because of her sobbing refusal to go on record when the vote was taken on the declaration of war, or because they could not find anything in her later performances to justify opening to her six years of service in the Senate, it would be idle to inquire. But the *Boston Herald* of August 31 was well within bounds when it said editorially:

"It goes against the grain to say of a woman what we ought to say of Jane Rankin, in her defeat for the senatorial nomination of her party in Montana."

It is a pity that more suffragists, who are of her way of thinking, do not follow Alice Brown's example in protesting vigorously against the course of the suffragists in attempting, during this crisis "to force the country into facing a secondary issue." In the letter elsewhere quoted, Miss Brown truthfully says that women who divert toward suffrage "one ounce of energy, one dollar of money which might be felt in the war, are sacrificing the greater for the less." That is a moderate statement; yet Miss Brown stands almost alone among suffragists in protesting against this mad folly.

CONSIDERING that this is a republic, and in view of the vast powers which Congress, under the stress of war necessities, has conferred upon the President, is it not just as well that he should learn that there are some things that he cannot do?

THE *Boston Herald* asks:

"Who can believe that the women of this country have their heart in the war because they hope to be paid with the ballot?"

No one can believe it of "the women of this country." It is true only of women of the type of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt who, on the 13th of May, 1917, speaking at Columbus, Ohio, declared that American women were "asked to mobilize their forces in aid of a government which has wronged them," and added: "We have been patient, infinitely patient, but we grow rebellious."

The *Suffragist* of July 6th said:

"With our nation at war with the greatest military power in the world, with a million American men on the front, American women must devote themselves to the task of organizing every State in the Union, of collecting large sums of money, of sending speakers from New York to California and from Maine to Florida, urging the people to remonstrate against the refusal of the President's party to respect the principle of democracy in America."

But why must they? The only reason in sight is the obstinacy of a body of wilful women, who insist on having their own way, in spite of the wishes of a large majority of the men and women of the country.

EVIDENTLY, the Suffragists have no high hopes of carrying Louisiana for the suffrage amendment to the State constitution, which is to be voted on next month. The *Suffragist*, in its issue of June 8, said: "A referendum in that state is a waste of women's time and money, another easy way of proving that the women of the South do not want the ballot." But, even when there is proof after proof that women do not want the ballot, The *Suffragist* insists that it ought to be forced upon them.

THE SUFFRAGISTS are rejoicing because, in the New York primaries, one woman was nominated for Congress, three for the State Senate, and twelve for the House. Their rejoicing may be somewhat chastened when they scrutinize the election returns next month.